

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 36, NO. 3

October 19, 1942

WHOLE NO. 954

## COMMENTS ON CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

Clement of Rome (*Rife*); Use and Interpretation of Parable (*Clark*); Acts 15.9; Romans 12.19 (*Durham*); Prosopographia Christiana (*Tongue*); Arceo, A Neglected Source for Vulgar Latin (*Skiles*)

## REVIEWS

BODKIN, Quest for Salvation in an Ancient and a Modern Play (*Hickman*); WALSH, Medieval Humanism (*Lind*); DEWING, DOWNEY, Procopius 7 (*Upson*)

## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

Book II  
Now Ready

Outstanding for their teaching method and their meaningful content, the JENKINS-WAGENER books make Latin vital and useful.

Jenkins and Wagener

# LATIN AND THE ROMANS

Book I, \$1.68    Book II, \$2.12

subject to discount

## GINN AND COMPANY

Boston    New York    Chicago    Atlanta    Dallas    Columbus    San Francisco

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

John P. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 36 contains issues dated: October 5, 12, 19, 26; November 2, 16, 30; December 7, 14 (1942); January 11, 18, 25; February 8, 15; March 1, 8, 15, 22, 29; April 5, 12; May 10, 17, 24; June 7 (1943).

## COMING ATTRACTIONS

### OCTOBER 29-31 Wayne Hotel, Hamilton

#### OHIO CLASSICAL CONFERENCE

President: Professor Frank H. Cowles, College of Wooster

Vice-Presidents: Rev. William R. Hennes, Xavier University; Miss Jean Stoner, Laurel School, Cleveland

Secretary: Professor John N. Hough, Ohio State University

Local Committee in Charge: Professor Frank L. Clark, Dr. Narka Nelson, Miss Annabel E. Cathcart, Professor F. Stuart Crawford, Miss Clara E. Ramsey, Mrs. Jean Druhot, Professor Henry C. Montgomery, chairman

#### PROGRAM

Thursday 2:30 P.M. Oxford College Auditorium, Oxford

President Frank H. Cowles, presiding

Papers: Professor Kenneth M. Abbott, Ohio State University; Rev. A. M. Zamiara, Milford Novitiate; Dr. Alice Catherine Ferguson, Ashland College; Professor Frank R. Kramer, Heidelberg College

Tour of the Oxford campuses

Thursday 8 P.M. Benton Hall, Miami University  
Concert by Western College and Miami University musical organizations

Friday 9:15 A.M. Wayne Hotel, Hamilton

Professor J. Merle Rife, Muskingum College, presiding

Papers: Miss Margaret Wright, Wilbur Wright High School, Dayton; Dr. Edwin L. Findley, Fenn College; Mr. Howard H. Dowlin, University School, Cincinnati; Professor LeRoy A. Campbell, Hiram College

Friday 2 P.M. Wayne Hotel, Hamilton

Professor D. T. Schoonover, Marietta College, presiding

Papers: Miss Betty Helen Burt, High School, Girard; Professor Arthur M. Young, University of Akron; Professor Jeremy Ingalls, Western College

Friday 3:30 P.M. Wayne Hotel, Hamilton

Conference Groups

Secondary, Miss Jean Stoner, Laurel School, Cleveland, presiding

Participants: Miss Agnes M. Burgess, Central High School, Euclid; Mr. Chester A. Burns, St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland; Miss Clara Fink, Hughes High School, Cincinnati

College and University, Rev. William R. Hennes, Xavier University, presiding

Participants: Professor F. Stuart Crawford, Miami University; Professor L. R. Dean, Denison University; Professor Paul R. Murphy, Mount Union College

Friday 6:30 P.M. Dinner Meeting, Wayne Hotel

Speakers: Hon. Leo J. Walsh, Mayor of Hamilton; Mr. C. W. White, Superintendent of Hamilton Schools; Mrs. Alexander Thompson, President, Western College; President Alfred H. Upham, Miami University; President Frank H. Cowles; Professor Joseph Remenyi, Cleveland College

Saturday 9:15 A.M.

Miss Mary K. Brokaw, Ohio University presiding

Papers: Miss Mildred Fisher, High School, Jackson; Miss Anita Strauch, Johnny Applesseed Junior High School, Mansfield; Miss Grace Griffith, High School, Lancaster

### NOVEMBER 7 Central High School, Trenton

#### NEW JERSEY CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

10 A.M. Trends in College Board Testing, Dr. John F. Gummere, Headmaster, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia; Greek Temples and Shrines, Mrs. Clara Johnson Lodholz, Philadelphia

11 A.M. Panel Discussion on Latin Writing: Professor Shirley Smith, New Jersey College for Women; Dr. Walter Freeman, Upper Montclair Teachers College; Dr. Walter Myers, Camden; Ernest F. White, South Orange

## COMMENTS ON CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

**Clement of Rome**

Clement of Rome's letter to the Corinthians stands first in that little collection of Greek documents known as the Apostolic Fathers. The works of the ten authors represented constitute a small volume which, in language, spirit, date of writing, and venerability, stands closer than any other book to the New Testament.

The passage of most curious interest in Clement is Chapter XV, where he gives his version of the legend of the Phoenix, the Arabian bird that lives 2500 years. As the time of his death approaches, he makes a nest of frankincense, myrrh and the other spices. Here he dies and the worm that is produced in his decaying body is metamorphosed into the new Phoenix, who takes the nest and bones of his predecessor to Egypt and deposits them on the altar of the sun in Heliopolis.

The general purpose of the letter is to help restore peace and order after a rebellion in the Church of Corinth. Several of the Apostolic Fathers, as well as some New Testament books, testify to the struggles and disorders that accompanied the development of the Christian hierarchy. Clement clearly presents the doctrine of the apostolic succession: God sent Jesus Christ, the Lord Jesus Christ sent the apostles, the apostles appointed bishops and deacons; the point being of course that the believers at Corinth were to obey their contemporaries who held office in this succession. The same argument for church unity is presented in the Gospel according to John, where Jesus says to his disciples: "Just as the father sent me, so I am sending you." In the same connection Clement offers the sociologically and psychologically sound argument that the Jews had a similar succession of religious leaders, i.e., God had appointed Moses, Moses had established the offices of priests and levites, which had come down in regular succession. The appeal to Jewish models for Christian institutions was a common form of argument in the early church. Clement clearly states that his letter is not only for the benefit of the Corinthians, but for the Romans as well. That is to say, the author hopes this letter, like Paul's "letter" to the Corinthians, will be read in other churches.

But who is this Clement? He is one of the earliest bishops of Rome. Macaulay eloquently writes of the "august dynasty" of the "supreme pontiffs" that extends back "far beyond the time of Pepin" "till it is lost in the twilight of fable." In spite of the "twilight," there is no doubt this letter was written by Clement, Bishop of Rome, and little doubt it was written near the end of Domitian's reign. It is therefore older than the latest books of the New Testament, being itself included in some ancient copies of the New Testament. It is the earliest of the Apostolic Fathers, and contains

our earliest witness to the martyrdom of Paul: but the testimony is stated with that tantalizing indefiniteness so often found in primary sources. "The reward of patience is seen in Paul, victim of envy and strife, seven times in chains, fugitive, stoned, preaching both in east and in west, finally accorded the noble glory due his faith; who, after teaching the whole world uprightness, and reaching the boundary of the west, and testifying before the authorities, was released from this world and departed to the place of holiness, patience being supremely exemplified."

Classical students are inevitably reminded by this document that Greek was very much at home in Rome. At the end of the first century the Roman bishop is writing to the Corinthians in their own language. This is no more remarkable than Paul writing to the Romans in Greek in the middle of the first century, or than a Roman emperor writing his meditations in Greek after the end of the second century. Greek seems to have been the official language of the Roman Church until the middle of the third century. A few Greek words still remain enshrined in the Latin of the Mass, fossil witnesses to the time when Greek flourished at Rome and even threatened to crowd Latin out of the city. Hermas, most voluminous of the Apostolic Fathers, was also a Roman, and the Apostolic Fathers all wrote in Greek. Latin patristic literature does not appear until the end of the second century or beginning of the third.

Clement's Greek is a plain, sober, very simple, literary Koine; a contrast to the wordy colloquialism of his garrulous contemporary, Hermas, a contrast befitting the dignity of a bishop as against the undisciplined talk of a former slave and would-be occupant of the front seat. Clement quotes the Greek Old Testament frequently and at length. His style and thought are prosaic, except for the prayers, which remind one of the impressive force and dignity of the Greek Orthodox Liturgy. The chief attraction of the letter is its priceless value as a primary source for Roman history in general, for various phases of church history, and for the history of the Greek language. For persons of such interests there are arresting items in almost every one of the sixty-five short chapters.

J. MERLE RIFE

MUSKINGUM COLLEGE

**The Use and Interpretation of Parable**

In the Gospel of Mark (4.26-9) is a parable attributed to Jesus, used to illustrate the idea of the Kingdom of God. Various captions have been given to this parable, but we call it here the Parable of the Self-Productive Soil.



The Kingdom of God is as though a man were to sow seed on the ground and continue to sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should sprout and grow—a thing which he himself does not understand. The soil is self-productive, first a blade, then an ear, then the filled-out grain in the ear. So whenever the ripened grain should permit, he then sends off the sickle because the harvest stands ready.

Commentators have found a wide range of meanings in this brief parable, many quite conflicting. Some hold that the simile points out that the Kingdom *grows*—will grow or is growing, or even has been growing—or that it is inevitable, or invisible, or orderly, or gradual, or of slow evolution. Others see catastrophic or eschatological teaching therein. Some treat it as an allegory (with various applications), others as a “pure” parable, while still others interpret it as though it were a historical event. Many seek specific historical events or circumstances to match the elements, and to apply the teaching thereto.

All this variety and intricacy of interpretation fails to comprehend the true character of parable or to recognize the simple nature of the parabolic function. A parable is the free possession of any author—whether it is novel or traditional—to use as his own caprice or choice may determine. The same parable, or a closely similar one, is used to illustrate widely divergent points, even opposite points, as any author may chance to apply it. But a parable normally illustrates only and exclusively *one* point for the author, usually an obvious point which can be learned by the reader only from the immediate literary context.

To gain perspective on this point, let us observe other selected parables quite similar in form, used by some of Mark's contemporaries. In his Discourses (4.8) Epictetus criticizes those who rush to don philosopher's attire, and he uses a seed simile.<sup>1</sup>

Fruit grows thus: the seed must be buried for some time, hid, grow slowly in order that it may come to perfection. But if it produces the ear before the jointed stem, it is imperfect, a produce of the garden of Adonis. Such a poor plant are you also; you have blossomed too soon; the cold weather will scorch you up. . . . Let the root grow, then acquire the first joint, then the second, and then the third; in this way then the fruit will naturally force itself out, even if I do not choose.

Is the commentator inclined to debate the meaning of this simile of how philosophers are made? Is the development inevitable, partly invisible, divine, slow, by set stages, finally catastrophic, etc.? The exclusive point of Epictetus is clear and simple and supported by the context; clothes do not make the philosopher, but the true philosopher comes to be by substantial maturation of an innate capacity.

Clement of Rome, however, uses such a simile (23),<sup>2</sup> differently when he advises the Corinthian Christians:

<sup>1</sup> Translation by George Long 1900.

<sup>2</sup> Translations of both Clement and pseudo-Clement by Kirsopp Lake (Loeb ed.) 1912.

Let this Scripture be far from us where it says, “Wretched are the double-minded, who doubt in their soul and say, ‘We heard these things even in our fathers’ time, and behold we have grown old, and nothing of them has come about.’ Oh, foolish men, compare yourselves to a tree. Take a vine; first it sheds the leaves, then a bud comes, then a leaf, then a flower, and after this an unripe grape, then a bunch of grapes hangs present.” Observe that in a short time the fruit of the tree comes to ripeness. Truly, his will will be quickly and suddenly fulfilled, the Scripture also adding its witness that “he will come quickly and will not delay; and the Lord will come suddenly to his temple, even the Holy One whom you await.”

Here we see the same type of simile used to set forth an idea almost opposite to that of Epictetus. Clement's idea is clearly apocalyptic and eschatological, the point of his parable being the imminence of fulfillment. It would be useless to worry whether the tree is correctly compared with men, or with their situation, or whether any allegorical identifications may be discovered. It is idle to debate the issues of gradualness, orderliness, etc.

But lest we hasten to apply either Epictetus or Clement to Mark's Parable of the Self-Productive Soil, let us now note how pseudo-Clement (11) utilizes the simile of Clement:

For the prophetic word also says, “Wretched are the double-minded who doubt in their heart and say, ‘We heard these things long ago even in our fathers’ time and though we have waited day after day we have seen nothing of them.’ Oh, foolish men, compare yourselves to a tree. Take a vine; first it sheds the leaves, then a bud comes, after this an unripe grape, then a bunch of grapes hangs present. So also my people has had tumults and afflictions; afterwards it shall receive good things.” So, my brothers, we are not to be double-minded, but we are to persist in the hope we have held in order that we may also receive the reward.

In any effort to understand Mark's Parable of the Self-Productive Soil, we are therefore aware that various ideas may be drawn from the same type or pattern. While Epictetus sees the maturation of innate quality in the successive stages of the plant, Clement sees supernatural immediacy; pseudo-Clement sees the reward of persistence, though his quoted source saw good things to follow afflictions. Furthermore, each author who employs a parable is free to select the particular point he wishes it to illustrate. As a parable, it should be expected to yield but *one* general idea in each context, and probably no others at all. Many commentators expressly agree to this general proposition, but almost all violate it.<sup>3</sup> In all four forms noted here, the simile is used as a parable and is given no allegorical interpretation. It may be granted that anyone is free to allegorize it, the product being *his own* allegory. The point of such a parable, then, is not discerned from any particular pattern or from the specialized detail. It is discoverable only from the context and the large outline of the simile. In

<sup>3</sup> Barnett, Branscomb, and Rawlinson are among the commendable exceptions who adhere to this proposition in their interpretation of this parable.

the Parable of the Self-Productive Soil, no commentator has missed one point although he may urge chiefly some other and debate still others. This one point is that the Kingdom comes through a mysterious, divine power. All other points should be considered irrelevant.

B. T. D. Smith (Parables of the Synoptic Gospels 1937), for example, sees the main idea in "an appointed order which may not be hurried or deranged." For him, the parable "intended not merely to inculcate a temper of quiet waiting upon God, but to condemn those fanatical spirits" who might resort to revolution. J. Weiss observes that Jesus (as the sower) "cannot compel the arrival of the Kingdom of God" (sic Loisy and LaGrange). (The gospels indicate that the urgency of the Kingdom's coming exerted pressure on Jesus and the disciples, not vice versa.) Swete thinks the main teaching relates to human responsibility, and Cadoux says it lies in man's cooperation with the mysterious powers of nature. Oesterley writes, "The leading thought is that the growth and development of the Kingdom takes time." A further complication comes from William Manson and C. H. Dodd, from the angle of "realized eschatology." Manson declares the parable teaches that "God's idea is already cast into the processes of history as the seed is cast into the ground." Dodd here reads an allegory with Jesus "standing in the presence of the ripe crop, and taking active steps to 'put in the sickle' . . . It is the fulfillment of the Process."

Dodd believes that "the interpretation of the parable depends upon the view taken of the Kingdom of God." We believe, rather, that only the reverse procedure is safe, viz., that we derive our understanding of the idea of the Kingdom in part from the objective interpretation of such parables. The intricate superstructure which commentators have reared upon this brief and simple parable is a house of cards. Their speculations are precarious, and in complete disregard of the nature of parable. We urge the necessity of rejecting the various complicated, subsidiary issues often joined to the parable. The residue reveals one simple thought, also supported in the context. When Mark has Jesus say that the Kingdom is similar to the fruit-bearing of the *αὐτομάτη γῆ*, he simply means that the Kingdom comes to man through the mysterious, divine power.

KENNETH W. CLARK

DUKE UNIVERSITY

# Acts 15.9; Romans 12.19

The words *τῇ πίστει καθάρισας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν* (Acts 15.9) occur in an address of Peter before a group assembled to study a problem that had arisen and was causing dissensions in the church. Paul and Barnabas had been preaching to the Gentiles and had made num-

erous converts. But some of the Jewish converts, notably the Pharisees, maintained that circumcision was a requirement of all Christians since the new religion had begun as a movement within Judaism. This argument was brought before the meeting, and Peter was opposing it. He begins (verse 7): Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.

Notice that the words *τῇ πίστει* stand at the beginning of the phrase; they are important and emphatic, in contrast to the idea of salvation by obeying the law, which is the doctrine maintained by the Pharisees among them. The Authorized Version quoted above and a half-dozen recent versions I have seen fail to bring this out clearly. Placing "by faith" at the end as they do weakens it. Say rather "Since it is by faith (not by their conformity to the law) that he cleanses their hearts."

So in verse 11: *ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι καθ'ὃν τρόπον κἀκεῖνοι* loses clearness in the Authorized Version: "But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they." Here recent translators have done better. Goodspeed (University of Chicago Press 1931), for example, has: "It is by the mercy of the Lord Jesus that we are saved, just as they are." In this passage he catches the point made by the order of the words, though he misses it in verse 9.

This passage in Romans 12.19 has caused the translators much trouble: *δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ*. The Authorized Version renders it: "Give place unto wrath," which translates the words, indeed, but if it means anything at all, it must be understood as "Make room for wrath" or "Let wrath have its way." This is hardly in keeping with the context. The Revisers of 1881 made no change in the body of the text, but added in the Margin "Or, the wrath of God," a reading preferred by the American Committee. Of course the words "of God" are a pure invention offered in a desperate effort to approximate the sense obviously demanded. More recent translators have done no better. Goodspeed says "Leave room for God's anger." Weymouth (The New Testament in Modern Speech, Boston 1909) gives "Give way before anger," explaining in a footnote "i.e., the anger of your opponent." The Shorter Bible (Scribner 1918) proposes "Let the wrath of God have its way."

None of these renderings makes Paul say what he must have meant. The papyri have not furnished us with examples which might clear up the meaning of the idiom. The clue is found in modern Greek, where the phrase *δότε τόπον* means 'avoid' which is what Paul

The Kingdom of God is as though a man were to sow seed on the ground and continue to sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should sprout and grow—a thing which he himself does not understand. The soil is self-productive, first a blade, then an ear, then the filled-out grain in the ear. So whenever the ripened grain should permit, he then sends off the sickle because the harvest stands ready.

Commentators have found a wide range of meanings in this brief parable, many quite conflicting. Some hold that the simile points out that the Kingdom *grows*—will grow or is growing, or even has been growing—or that it is inevitable, or invisible, or orderly, or gradual, or of slow evolution. Others see catastrophic or eschatological teaching therein. Some treat it as an allegory (with various applications), others as a “pure” parable, while still others interpret it as though it were a historical event. Many seek specific historical events or circumstances to match the elements, and to apply the teaching thereto.

All this variety and intricacy of interpretation fails to comprehend the true character of parable or to recognize the simple nature of the parabolic function. A parable is the free possession of any author—whether it is novel or traditional—to use as his own caprice or choice may determine. The same parable, or a closely similar one, is used to illustrate widely divergent points, even opposite points, as any author may chance to apply it. But a parable normally illustrates only and exclusively *one* point for the author, usually an obvious point which can be learned by the reader only from the immediate literary context.

To gain perspective on this point, let us observe other selected parables quite similar in form, used by some of Mark's contemporaries. In his Discourses (4.8) Epictetus criticizes those who rush to don philosopher's attire, and he uses a seed simile.<sup>1</sup>

Fruit grows thus: the seed must be buried for some time, hid, grow slowly in order that it may come to perfection. But if it produces the ear before the jointed stem, it is imperfect, a produce of the garden of Adonis. Such a poor plant are you also; you have blossomed too soon; the cold weather will scorch you up. . . . Let the root grow, then acquire the first joint, then the second, and then the third; in this way then the fruit will naturally force itself out, even if I do not choose.

Is the commentator inclined to debate the meaning of this simile of how philosophers are made? Is the development inevitable, partly invisible, divine, slow, by set stages, finally catastrophic, etc.? The exclusive point of Epictetus is clear and simple and supported by the context; clothes do not make the philosopher, but the true philosopher comes to be by substantial maturation of an innate capacity.

Clement of Rome, however, uses such a simile (23),<sup>2</sup> differently when he advises the Corinthian Christians:

<sup>1</sup> Translation by George Long 1900.

<sup>2</sup> Translations of both Clement and pseudo-Clement by Kirsopp Lake (Loeb ed.) 1912.

Let this Scripture be far from us where it says, “Wretched are the double-minded, who doubt in their soul and say, ‘We heard these things even in our fathers’ time, and behold we have grown old, and nothing of them has come about.’ Oh, foolish men, compare yourselves to a tree. Take a vine; first it sheds the leaves, then a bud comes, then a leaf, then a flower, and after this an unripe grape, then a bunch of grapes hangs present.” Observe that in a short time the fruit of the tree comes to ripeness. Truly, his will will be quickly and suddenly fulfilled, the Scripture also adding its witness that “he will come quickly and will not delay; and the Lord will come suddenly to his temple, even the Holy One whom you await.”

Here we see the same type of simile used to set forth an idea almost opposite to that of Epictetus. Clement's idea is clearly apocalyptic and eschatological, the point of his parable being the imminence of fulfillment. It would be useless to worry whether the tree is correctly compared with men, or with their situation, or whether any allegorical identifications may be discovered. It is idle to debate the issues of gradualness, orderliness, etc.

But lest we hasten to apply either Epictetus or Clement to Mark's Parable of the Self-Productive Soil, let us now note how pseudo-Clement (11) utilizes the simile of Clement:

For the prophetic word also says, “Wretched are the double-minded who doubt in their heart and say, ‘We heard these things long ago even in our fathers’ time and though we have waited day after day we have seen nothing of them.’ Oh, foolish men, compare yourselves to a tree. Take a vine; first it sheds the leaves, then a bud comes, after this an unripe grape, then a bunch of grapes hangs present. So also my people has had tumults and afflictions; afterwards it shall receive good things.” So, my brothers, we are not to be double-minded, but we are to persist in the hope we have held in order that we may also receive the reward.

In any effort to understand Mark's Parable of the Self-Productive Soil, we are therefore aware that various ideas may be drawn from the same type or pattern. While Epictetus sees the maturation of innate quality in the successive stages of the plant, Clement sees supernatural immediacy; pseudo-Clement sees the reward of persistence, though his quoted source saw good things to follow afflictions. Furthermore, each author who employs a parable is free to select the particular point he wishes it to illustrate. As a parable, it should be expected to yield but *one* general idea in each context, and probably no others at all. Many commentators expressly agree to this general proposition, but almost all violate it.<sup>3</sup> In all four forms noted here, the simile is used as a parable and is given no allegorical interpretation. It may be granted that anyone is free to allegorize it, the product being *his own* allegory. The point of such a parable, then, is not discerned from any particular pattern or from the specialized detail. It is discoverable only from the context and the large outline of the simile. In

<sup>3</sup> Barnett, Branscomb, and Rawlinson are among the commendable exceptions who adhere to this proposition in their interpretation of this parable.



the Parable of the Self-Productive Soil, no commentator has missed one point although he may urge chiefly some other and debate still others. This one point is that the Kingdom comes through a mysterious, divine power. All other points should be considered irrelevant.

B. T. D. Smith (Parables of the Synoptic Gospels 1937), for example, sees the main idea in "an appointed order which may not be hurried or deranged." For him, the parable "intended not merely to inculcate a temper of quiet waiting upon God, but to condemn those fanatical spirits" who might resort to revolution. J. Weiss observes that Jesus (as the sower) "cannot compel the arrival of the Kingdom of God" (sic Loisy and LaGrange). (The gospels indicate that the urgency of the Kingdom's coming exerted pressure on Jesus and the disciples, not vice versa.) Swete thinks the main teaching relates to human responsibility, and Cadoux says it lies in man's cooperation with the mysterious powers of nature. Oesterley writes, "The leading thought is that the growth and development of the Kingdom takes time." A further complication comes from William Manson and C. H. Dodd, from the angle of "realized eschatology." Manson declares the parable teaches that "God's idea is already cast into the processes of history as the seed is cast into the ground." Dodd here reads an allegory with Jesus "standing in the presence of the ripe crop, and taking active steps to 'put in the sickle' . . . It is the fulfillment of the Process."

Dodd believes that "the interpretation of the parable depends upon the view taken of the Kingdom of God." We believe, rather, that only the reverse procedure is safe, viz., that we derive our understanding of the idea of the Kingdom in part from the objective interpretation of such parables. The intricate superstructure which commentators have reared upon this brief and simple parable is a house of cards. Their speculations are precarious, and in complete disregard of the nature of parable. We urge the necessity of rejecting the various complicated, subsidiary issues often joined to the parable. The residue reveals one simple thought, also supported in the context. When Mark has Jesus say that the Kingdom is similar to the fruit-bearing of the *αὐτομάτη γῆ*, he simply means that the Kingdom comes to man through the mysterious, divine power.

KENNETH W. CLARK

DUKE UNIVERSITY

### Acts 15.9; Romans 12.19

The words *τῇ πίστει καθάρισας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν* (Acts 15.9) occur in an address of Peter before a group assembled to study a problem that had arisen and was causing dissensions in the church. Paul and Barnabas had been preaching to the Gentiles and had made num-

erous converts. But some of the Jewish converts, notably the Pharisees, maintained that circumcision was a requirement of all Christians since the new religion had begun as a movement within Judaism. This argument was brought before the meeting, and Peter was opposing it. He begins (verse 7): Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.

Notice that the words *τῇ πίστει* stand at the beginning of the phrase; they are important and emphatic, in contrast to the idea of salvation by obeying the law, which is the doctrine maintained by the Pharisees among them. The Authorized Version quoted above and a half-dozen recent versions I have seen fail to bring this out clearly. Placing "by faith" at the end as they do weakens it. Say rather "Since it is by faith (not by their conformity to the law) that he cleanses their hearts."

So in verse 11: *ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι καθ'ὃν τρόπον κακέειποι* loses clearness in the Authorized Version: "But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they." Here recent translators have done better. Goodspeed (University of Chicago Press 1931), for example, has: "It is by the mercy of the Lord Jesus that we are saved, just as they are." In this passage he catches the point made by the order of the words, though he misses it in verse 9.

This passage in Romans 12.19 has caused the translators much trouble: *δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ*. The Authorized Version renders it: "Give place unto wrath," which translates the words, indeed, but if it means anything at all, it must be understood as "Make room for wrath" or "Let wrath have its way." This is hardly in keeping with the context. The Revisers of 1881 made no change in the body of the text, but added in the Margin "Or, the wrath of God," a reading preferred by the American Committee. Of course the words "of God" are a pure invention offered in a desperate effort to approximate the sense obviously demanded. More recent translators have done no better. Goodspeed says "Leave room for God's anger." Weymouth (The New Testament in Modern Speech, Boston 1909) gives "Give way before anger," explaining in a footnote "i.e., the anger of your opponent." The Shorter Bible (Scribner 1918) proposes "Let the wrath of God have its way."

None of these renderings makes Paul say what he must have meant. The papyri have not furnished us with examples which might clear up the meaning of the idiom. The clue is found in modern Greek, where the phrase *δότε τόπον* means 'avoid' which is what Paul

intended to say. I quote the whole passage (verses 17-9) in the King James version, except for the word 'avoid':

Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather avoid wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

Those who essay to publish a translation of the New Testament should study modern Greek.

DONALD BLYTHE DURHAM

HAMILTON COLLEGE

### Prosopographia Christiana

Many have already heard of the elaborate project which has been launched at Fordham University under the direction of Rev. Joseph M. F. Marique, S. J. At the April meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States Father Marique described the compilation of a biographical dictionary of all Christians of the first six centuries, to be based entirely and exhaustively upon primary sources. Inscriptions, papyri, pagan and Christian authors, Oriental as well as classical, are being studied with a view to the new Prosopographia. When completed this work will enable scholars to begin, at least, a definitive history of the early centuries of Christianity.

The enormity of the undertaking impressed Father Marique's audience, but it was generally felt that success was predictable. Fortunately the work has enlisted the support of several scholars whose help will be essential. Among them is Professor E. K. Rand of Harvard University. Sometimes the help is indirect, as with Professor B. D. Meritt, who has requested students to be on the alert for names of Christians in their reading of Attic inscriptions. More direct aid is necessary, however, particularly in the immediate task of reading and excerpting the huge bulk of the literature involved.

Many colleges can aid in this valuable enterprise. For example, at St. Bonaventure College, with the encouragement of Rev. Thomas Plassmann, President, and Rev. Lambert Zaleha of the Classics Department, Dr. John Alexander and I have begun to direct some of our students of the Graduate Summer School in the process of reading and excerpting in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Ammianus Marcellinus and Origen. This work is done as part of the research required for the Master's degree and is excellent experience in the work of accurate and selective quotation that is necessary for graduate study. There is the additional advantage that a student may in this process find that he has gathered source material which could form the basis of an interesting and valuable dissertation. A plan like this might also be applied to undergraduate majors for part of their senior year's work, as

we may do here at Allegheny College with Arnobius the coming year.

The purpose of this example is to present one way in which the work of the project is being facilitated. Many will be interested in working in some field or author of their choice. Whatever the method is, the important fact, as Father Marique recently remarked, is that "although we have many collaborators we have by no means a sufficient number for the gigantic task." It is hoped that in the very near future many scholars will write to him to express a desire to contribute to an undertaking which will result in a great monument of the scholarship of Christian tradition.

WILLIAM R. TONGUE

ALLEGHENY COLLEGE

### Arbeo, A Neglected Source for Vulgar Latin

Sometimes the writings of an author who has significant literary, historical, or linguistic import lie virtually untouched by research in their most important aspects. Such an author is Arbeo,<sup>1</sup> Bishop of Freising, c. 765-84, known to us also by the name Heres, which seems to be the Latin translation of his Germanic name (cf. Goth. *arbja* 'heir'),<sup>2</sup> and by the name Cyrinus, apparently a Latinized form of the Hebrew translation,<sup>3</sup> who was born in the first half of the eighth century, probably at Freising, was reared by Erembercht (bishop 739-47?), passed through various clerical offices, being a priest from 754 to 763, became bishop not later than 765, and died c. 784.<sup>4</sup> He has left us two lives of saints, the *Vita Sancti Corbiniani* (which seems to have been written by 769) and the *Vita vel Passio Sancti Haimhrammi martyris* (c. 772),<sup>5</sup> and seven (possibly eight) chartae of the years 755-63, for which he was the scribe, and twenty-eight chartae of the years 765-82 which expressly say that they were dictated ("ex ore") by him.<sup>6</sup>

These *Vitae* have been edited as contributions to history by B. Krusch in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*<sup>7</sup> but with only scant attention to the lin-

<sup>1</sup> Various spelled Arbio, Arpio and Aribio.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. B. Krusch, ed., *Vitae Corbiniani episcopi*, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 6, Hahn, Hannover & Leipzig 1913, 511-2. This series will be referred to as MGH,SRM.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. B. Krusch, ed., *Vita vel passio Haimhrammi martyris*, MGH,SRM 4(1902) 455, note 9.

<sup>4</sup> Evidence for these dates is given by Krusch, MGH,SRM 6.510-1; 513 and 586, note 1; 513; 513; 515, respectively.

<sup>5</sup> For the evidence for these dates cf. MGH,SRM 6.527 and 513.

<sup>6</sup> These chartae are all quoted with dates by F. H. Hundt, "Ueber die bayerischen Urkunden aus der Zeit der Agilolfinger," *Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaft XII, Erste Abth.*, Munich 1872, 196-211, 216-7.

<sup>7</sup> The *Vita Corbiniani* in MGH,SRM 6.496-635 and the *Vita Haimhrammi* in MGH,SRM 4.452-524.



guistic material, which seems to me to be exceedingly significant. To be sure, Krusch in his introduction lists some of the unusual forms and expressions, but he seems to be unaware of their significance as representatives of the last years of Vulgar Latin. Also E. Wölfflin<sup>8</sup> has given us a one-page glance at the linguistic phenomena of the Vita Corbiniani, and a monograph of mine<sup>9</sup> has given a classification of the lexicographical, phonological, morphological, syntactical and stylistic material in its bearing on the problem of Vulgar Latin. Indeed, in the two most recent monographs on the transition of Vulgar Latin into the Romance languages,<sup>10</sup> no mention is made of Ardeo's linguistic phenomena.

Both the Vita Corbiniani and the Vita Haimhrammi were written just before the linguistic reforms started by Pepin and completed by Charlemagne really got well under way, for Paul the Deacon came in 778 and Alcuin in 781, with the encyclical on the culture of letters in 786 and the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 789.<sup>11</sup> Also both Vitae exist in revised forms, more or less paraphrastic, written subsequent to the Carolingian reforms (and edited by Krusch alongside the original Vitae). Possibly these revisions came out of the research done by the priest Cosroh when, some time after 824, Hitto, Bishop of Freising, gave him the task of collecting into one volume all the traditions about Freising which were to be found in the chartae (cf. Krusch, MGH, SRM 6.537). At any rate these revisions show an earnest endeavor to rewrite the Vitae in classical Latin and seem to have been more popular than the originals for we have only two manuscripts (ninth century) of the Vita Corbiniani but 31 (tenth to fifteenth centuries) of the revision. The interesting thing here from a linguistic standpoint is the fact that we can surmise from these Vitae and their revisions exactly what happened to Latin during the Carolingian Renaissance; for the reforms could change the educated classes' way of writing Latin, but they could not seriously affect the great mass of people who spoke but could not write Latin, and it seems that these reforms caused the written Latin to become an artificial generally unspoken medium endeavoring to follow classical models while the vernacular continued to develop to-

ward Old French. As Ferdinand Lot, speaking of this period ("À quelle époque a-t-on cessé de parler latin?" Bulletin Du Cange VI 1931, 150-1, says, "Le latin est redevenu une langue correcte, élégante parfois. Mais ce n'est plus une langue vivante, c'est une langue artificielle. . . . Son rôle est celui d'une langue auxiliaire. On l'écrit, mais on ne la parle pas. . . . Mais le monde laïque, parlant la *lingua romana*, échappa entièrement à la réforme. L'échec se manifeste d'une manière frappante dans ce qu'on appelle les 'emprunts latins' des langues romanes. En Gaule, notamment, ils commencent dès la regne de Charlemagne et se multiplient à mesure que le parler vulgaire s'éloigne du latin restauré." And Sas,<sup>12</sup> commenting on his written documents, says of the declensions, "As a result of the Carolingian renaissance, we note a slowing down of the process of development and a regression."

The vernacular, after the reforms, was so much different from the written language and the written language became so artificial that the changes in everyday speech went on uninhibited by comparison with the written language, and probably at a more rapid rate, with the result that the vernacular and the written language were soon felt to be two different languages. As Walther von Wartburg has said, "On pourrait donc dire que, grâce à la renaissance carolingienne, le français a pris conscience de lui-même" (Évolution et structure de la langue française<sup>2</sup> University of Chicago Press 1937, 59).

Here then in Ardeo's Vitae and in their revisions we have, virtually untouched by interpretative linguistic research, documents reflecting the vernacular Vulgar Latin of the period immediately preceding the Carolingian Renaissance and also the same documents, revised, showing the effect of the Renaissance on the written Latin. Furthermore, certain linguistic phenomena, transitional from Vulgar Latin into Old French, which could be attested by only a scant few examples, may now be clearly seen. These transitional phenomena are to be found in both of Ardeo's Vitae, but my present remarks are confined to those of the Vita Corbiniani.

It is interesting to note, first of all, that Ardeo himself realized that he was not writing literary Latin, for in his prefatory remarks he says that he seeks "ut rusticitatis tergat pulverem lingue virtutis modulum" (561.8).<sup>13</sup> Regardless of Ardeo's own realization and avowal of his "rusticitas," even the most casual reader would be struck by the clear fact that Ardeo is far from being at home in classical Latin, for there are many new words and many new meanings, many phonological changes, much variation in morphology and gender, and a huge amount of unusual and extraordinary syn-

<sup>8</sup>Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik 5(1888), 312.

<sup>9</sup>The Latinity of Ardeo's Vita Sancti Corbiniani and of the Revised Vita et Actus Beati Corbiniani Episcopi Frisingensis, University of Chicago dissertation 1938.

<sup>10</sup>M. A. Pei, The Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in Northern France, Columbia University dissertation 1932, and L. F. Sas, The Noun Declension in Merovingian Latin, André, Paris 1937. Pei, of course, was writing about a particular geographical field, but in all probability neither Pei nor Sas knew of Ardeo's writings, or they could hardly have refrained from citing data from them.

<sup>11</sup>H. F. Muller, A Chronology of Vulgar Latin, Niemeyer, Halle 1929, 78-9, 85.

<sup>12</sup>Sas, 483. Cf. also Muller, loc. cit.

<sup>13</sup>All references to the Vita Corbiniani will be to Krusch's edition.

tax. These phenomena may be discussed briefly under seven headings, as follows: (1) vocabulary, (2) phonology, (3) case morphology, (4) gender changes, (5) voice, (6) noun syntax, (7) verb syntax.

(1) In the field of lexicography there are approximately a hundred words not found in Forcellini, the Thesaurus, Harper's Latin Dictionary, Du Cange, Habel, or the Medieval Latin Word List, and a much larger number of semantic shifts not found in any of these. Most of the new words result from shifts in the declension or in the gender of nouns or of shifts in the conjugation of verbs. The entire list of both new words and new meanings has been published.<sup>14</sup> These are similar to the thousands of new words and new meanings that are still being found in lexicographical research in Mediaeval Latin.

(2) In phonology, among many changes, perhaps the most interesting are: (a) syncope, e.g., *domnum* (592.9) and *nubs* (593.1); (b) the dropping of an intervocalic consonant, e.g., *fuissent* (= *judissent* 563.15); (c) the dropping of final -t in verbs, e.g., *perduxisse* (585.7) and *amittere* (586.11); (d) the dropping of final -m, e.g., *quendam . . . subole* (585.5) and *ad vesperam . . . hora* (592.15), and the adding of final -m after a vowel, e.g., *verba ad audiendam vitae* (564.20) and *pro talique criminis factum* (581.7) for *facto*, indicative of the feebleness of the pronunciation of final -m and of the rise of the oblique case; (e) the dropping of final -s, e.g., *virgam pastoralis regimine* (566.25) for *regiminis* and *vires . . . aspera* (581.11), and the adding of final -s after a vowel, e.g., *sacra illius sectare monitas* (562.7) and *maleficiis suspitione* (585.2), indicative of the feebleness of the pronunciation of final -s and of the rise of the oblique case.

(3) In the morphology of nouns the most interesting phenomenon is the occurrence of more than fifty first-declension ablative singulars in -e or -ae, e.g., *sinistre manu pernatans* (572.2), *mulier . . . cum que . . . ibant viri* (585.2), *sub sancte conversationis regulae* (565.14), and *lantiae . . . piscem . . . percussit* (576.2); and the appearance of three first-declension accusative singulars in -e or -ae, *spinam pedes submisit* (562.18); *ob diei continentiae fasti* (575.17); *post sepulture* (590.1). These examples seem to show that final -a (long), -am, -ae and -e had all become phonetically equivalent and that the oblique case in -e (obscure) had already risen for the first declension. Even though the rise of the oblique case by this time is inferred by Grandgent (An Introduction to Vulgar Latin, Heath, Boston 1907, 103) and Pei (op. cit., 39), only a few more or less sporadic examples have been listed.<sup>15</sup> Also many other examples of the rise of the oblique case in the second and third declensions are found, but such

examples are well known elsewhere. Quite significant are two first-declension nominative plurals in -as, *viros orando tenere queunt feminas* (569.14) and *litteras . . . pervenerunt* (589.10). These forms may be added to the examples of the Vulgar Latin behind the Old French nominative plural in -es, for which Sas (80, 474) has shown we no longer need to posit a starred form.

(4) Quite significant are the third-declension masculines in -or which almost with regularity become feminine: *color* (589.17, *decor* (778.10), *fervor* (562.12), *furor* (585.8), *honor* (572.2; 580.2; 587.7; 589.11), *meror* (568.20) and *terror* (583.20). These forecast the regularity of the feminine in nouns in -or in French. The appearance of many neuter nouns of classical Latin as either masculine or feminine (cf. Skiles, 97-8) foreshadows the loss of the neuter in Romance.

(5) In verb morphology a great uncertainty about the passive forms appears: (a) the active is used with passive meaning, e.g., *a praefato vicario occideret* (586.2); (b) the active form of deponent verbs is used, e.g., *conaverat* (572.2); and (c) the passive is used with active meaning, e.g., *qui eum . . . deducerentur* (572.13). Especially are there a great number of the last two classes. These phenomena show that the use of the passive was becoming uncertain and foreshadow the general avoidance of the passive in Romance.

(6) In noun syntax there is a general break-up of case usages with (a) prepositions used with the genitive or dative, e.g., *munera sibi a fidelium commissa* (566.6) and *eum ad regalis auribus . . . accusare* (574.4), (b) accusative absolutes, e.g., *qui ex tanta experti* (= *experiti*) *terrore, vires receptos, domui confugebant* (583.20), (c) instead of a dative, the accusative with *ad* or *in*, e.g., *quem ad campum . . . Martias utebatur* (564.24), (d) the ablative of the gerund where a present participle would be expected, e.g., *ad remedia confessionis penitendo confugiunt* (581.14), which anticipates the Spanish usage, and (e) many other unusual constructions, such as nominative absolutes, genitives of cause, datives of place whither, accusatives of place where, ablatives with prepositions normally used with the accusative, ablatives of specification with *in*, etc. All these phenomena show that the feeling for case was being lost and foreshadow the coming of the Romance two-case system.

(7) In verb syntax perhaps the outstanding phenomenon is the use of the pluperfect subjunctive where the imperfect subjunctive would be expected, e.g., *praecepisset ne . . . remanisset* (579.12). There are many such examples which definitely show the emergence of the Romance imperfect subjunctive out of the Latin pluperfect subjunctive. Also the indicative definitely is supplanting the subjunctive in result clauses, in indirect questions, and elsewhere. For indirect dis-

<sup>14</sup> Skiles, 1-73; see note 9, above.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Sas, 52-3, 57, 71-3, 346, 416 and Pei, 37-9.

course *ut* and the subjunctive, the subjunctive alone, and *quod* or *quia* and the subjunctive or indicative are found. These constructions show that the classical infinitive with the subject in the accusative is giving way to the Romance analytical idiom in indirect discourse. *Debeo* is used many times with merely volitive or futurity significance, e.g., *praecepisset ut . . . custodire deberetur* (578.14) and *confitente ut vitam mutare debuisset* (563.25). This use of a helping verb shows the weakening of the modal force in the subjunctive and the rise of auxiliary verbs to replace modal forms. Lastly, there is one recurrent oddity that I cannot ex-

plain, namely, the use of the present participle where a third singular perfect indicative active would be expected, e.g., *ministros convocans, bisque astantibus praecepit* (563.11).

In fine we can draw from the evidence gathered from Argeo two general conclusions about the eighth century: (1) that Latin was well on its way toward the Romance developments, but (2) that the written Latin was still reflecting the vernacular and had not yet become a dead language.

JONAH W. D. SKILES

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE, MISSOURI

## REVIEWS

**The Quest for Salvation in an Ancient and a Modern Play.** By MAUD BODKIN. 54 pages. Oxford University Press, London 1941 (\$1.85)

A modern play which is frankly modeled after an ancient Greek tragedy might be expected to attract a classicist into a study in comparisons. However, in *The Quest for Salvation in an Ancient and a Modern Play*, it is a psychologist, not a classicist, who is comparing the work of the modern playwright, *The Family Reunion* by T. S. Eliot, with its Greek prototype, the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Miss Bodkin has approached her subject from a psychological viewpoint; and the fact that her book throws light upon two plays which have significance for our day makes it especially provocative and lively.

Both plays deal with the pursuit by the Furies of an individual sinner, with his quest for salvation, and with his final deliverance, involving the transformation of his pursuers. Briefly, Miss Bodkin's comparison runs thus: The Furies in Eliot's play are not mere projections of an individual conscience, but, like the Erinyes of Aeschylus, are ministers of an impersonal law of retribution having the aspect not only of malignant revenge, but also of primitive justice. In both plays the Furies are the embodiment of an intangible force which emanates from the wrongs of past generations and works with the power of "causal efficacy" through later generations. They are also the embodiment of a curse (alias "repetition-compulsion") which is the energy of passion fixed in an evil relationship or custom. When this energy is released and redirected, it becomes the sustaining force of a better order of individual and social life. In Aeschylus this release and change in relationships between the protagonist and his pursuers is wrought by the direct persuasion of Athena. In Eliot's play the transformation is the result of the redirection by his Aunt Agatha of the protagonist's mind into channels of remembrance and analysis of the experiences of his unhappy childhood.

Miss Bodkin does not take the next step in the analogy, although it seems important to do so if we are not to find ourselves sharing the bewilderment of the majority of the characters in Eliot's play. That is to say, in both plays, the execution of the will of God and submission to it are involved. It is significant that Aeschylus chose to have Athena cast the deciding vote at the trial of Orestes, thus making her the agent for the execution of the divine will, as she was also to become the agent for bringing about the conversion and submission of the Furies to that same divine will.

Similarly, the rôle which Agatha plays is consistent with the way in which God causes His will to be executed at the present time, that is, through human agency and through spiritual forces, rather than by the direct intervention of a divine being. If, as Miss Bodkin feels, Eliot was dealing here solely with individual salvation, his thesis is strangely inconsistent with the burden of his other writings.

One wonders why she questions the element of two-fold salvation in *The Family Reunion*, while she admits its achievement in the *Eumenides*. We know that Eliot has a plan for reorganizing the world, based upon the principles and teachings of Christ. To anyone who reads the description of his idea,<sup>1</sup> it is apparent that he, like Harry, has seen a vision, but that he, too, is at a loss to make that vision completely articulate so that others may understand. After Harry's deliverance, his relatives arrive at the mistaken conclusion that he is to become a missionary; and he is unable to explain that there is much more than that to his decision.

In the ancient play we have little more than the promise of blessings resulting from the achievement of communal salvation. It remained for history to write of its success or failure. So also with the suggestion of world deliverance today through the realization of Harry's (or Eliot's) vision. His plan is yet untried, and it remains for history to write the verdict.

The fact that one does not necessarily agree with Miss Bodkin at every point does not detract from the

<sup>1</sup>Cf. T. S. Eliot, *The Idea of a Christian Society*, Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1940.



enjoyment of her book, for it opens the door to an interesting field of reading and speculation; and the timeliness of her subject and its scholarly treatment make her book stimulating.

RUBY M. HICKMAN

CEDAR RAPIDS

**Medieval Humanism.** By GERALD GROVELAND WALSH. ix, 103 pages. Macmillan, New York 1942 \$1

Professor Walsh presents here "the substance of a series of lectures on the Tradition of Christian Humanism, which were given in 1939-40, as a Fordham University extension course, at the College of New Rochelle." Further, "It must be remembered that in so slight an essay the humanistic tradition has had to be looked at in isolation from the total pattern of medieval culture and religion."

These sentences indicate the scope and nature of this little book and partially account for its limitations. Addressed to a student public as a popular introductory manual in a group of texts called The Christendom Series, it often tends to assume the appearance of a mere list of names and dates interspersed with comment based on books such as Haskins, The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century, or Raby, A History of Christian Latin Poetry.

This does not mean that Professor Walsh has failed to add a certain originality to his book, although it sometimes takes the form of dogmatic statement. He is fond of reducing his vast subject to categories: "... Christian humanism supplements pagan humanism by the ideas of Creation, Incarnation, Sanctification" (2); "Medieval humanism might be described as a synthesis of the fivefold striving after happiness represented by Hellenic intelligence, Roman conscience, Christian grace, Celtic fancy and Teutonic feeling. The first step in its development was a welding or, better, wedding of Hellenism and Catholicism, of wisdom with Grace, of reason with Revelation, of philosophy with Faith, of human aspiration with supernatural Hope, of natural with Divine love, of *eros* with *charis*, of Plato with Christ" (10); "The Greek falls into pride; the Roman, into sensuality, greed, gluttony, lust; the Barbarians, into anger and envy; the Celt, into sloth" (33). No doubt there is much truth in such statements, but in their sweeping mutual exclusiveness they are too arbitrary to present a balanced account of the complex social and spiritual forces under discussion.

By humanism the author understands the pursuit of happiness through intelligence, conscience, and taste which, in turn, seek truth, goodness, beauty. In his first chapter he selects the words *σοφία*, *ἡλικία*, and *χάρις* as they appear in Luke 2:52 for the text of his interpretation. This leads to the treatment of the

Greek, Roman, German, and Celtic racial contributions to Christian Humanism. Then, in succession, Professor Walsh discusses what he calls the Carolingian Revivescence, Anglo-Saxon and Norman culture, the monastic teachers, the twelfth century, the medieval universities, scholasticism, and ends with an analysis of the work of Thomas Aquinas and Dante, perhaps the most stirring and eloquent part of the book. A bibliographical note and an abstract for study and review close the volume. There is no index.

The very important function of the universities in promoting the cause of Christian Humanism does not receive the space it deserves in even a limited survey; secular lyric is also neglected and, while many lesser figures are mentioned, the names of Walter of Chatillon, Hugo Primas, or the Archpoet do not appear. The efforts of Cassiodorus as a mediator between paganism and Christianity merit more attention than they are given. While Anselm is correctly regarded as a leader in scholasticism, we find nothing about such important figures as Fulbert of Chartres, Berengar of Tours, Petrus Damiani, or Radulfus Ardens in this too brief treatment of the subject. It is difficult to discover exactly what is meant by the latter parts of these sentences: "The efforts of Julian the Apostate (361-364) to strangle the new Catholic civilization with the silken cords of Greek culture had no other effect than to provide for future *Kulturkämpfen* a pattern of persecution that seems perennially destined to failure" (25) and "This State, however, is neither the Leviathan of modern Materialism nor the illusion of modern Idealism" (93).

More care should have been taken with dates, especially in a book for beginners. At page 64 Peter (Pierre at page 7) of Blois dies in 1204; the date is 1205 at page 7. As a matter of fact, he may have lived after 1204, the last date at which he is mentioned in a medieval document. Cicero died in 43, not 46 B.C., Ovid in 18, not 17 A.D., Sallust in 35, not 34 B.C. Lanfranc was born around 1003. Sister M. G. Wiegand dates the birth of Hrotsvitha in 935, not 932; at this point, students will recognize neither "the son of that awful woman Marozia" nor Marozia herself (58). Hildebert's date is 1056, not 1055; it is right on page 64, wrong on page 67. On the latter page the Latin elegiacs should be printed with the pentameters indented, as in the admirable English version following. We do not know the last date of Ordericus Vitalis, although Walsh gives 1145. Giraldus (not Geraldus) Cambrensis died in 1223, not 1220; William of Newbury is preferable to Newburgh. Petrus Comestor may have lived ten years after the last date given for him. I prefer the more usual Flora or the Italian Fiore instead of Floris in the name Joachim of Flora. It is time that the spelling Virgil disappeared from American books, at least. Read *gentleman-saint* (18), *cites* for *sites* (56), insert *no* after *do* at page 59, and read

*laetius* for *letius* at page 69. These slips are not extremely important in a book which is well reasoned, clearly written, and compressed into small space—a great achievement in our day of slovenly verbosity. The author's original verse translations are charming and accurate; he deserves credit for producing a useful and even stimulating volume.

L. R. LIND

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

**Procopius**, with an English Translation by H. B. DEWING with the Collaboration of GLANVILLE DOWNEY, in Seven Volumes. VII, Buildings, General Index to Procopius. xix, 542 pages, frontispiece, 6 plans, 3 maps. Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Heinemann, London 1940 (Loeb Classical Library, No. 343) \$2.50.

Procopius, the historian of the reign of Justinian (527-65 A.D.), was born in Caesarea in Palestine about the end of the fifth century. When still a young man he came to Constantinople to practise his chosen profession, the law. He became legal adviser and secretary to the young general Belisarius shortly before Justinian ascended the throne in 527, and from that time on his life was linked with the activities of the great general and his imperial master. Procopius accompanied Belisarius on his campaigns, and eventually became a person of rank at court; his unique position afforded him much first-hand information, and his literary tastes led him to pattern his writings after those of Herodotus and Thucydides.

In his three works, the History of the Wars, the Anecdota, or Secret History, and On Buildings, Procopius gives an account of the reign of Justinian until about 560 A.D. The date of his own death is uncertain; he was apparently still alive in 562. His first and greatest work is the History of the Wars, in eight books (volumes 1-5 of the Loeb translation). The first two of these are devoted to the Persian wars, the next two tell of the war fought against the Vandals in Africa, and the three following describe the troubles with the Goths in Italy. This much of the History was published in 550 or 551; the eighth book is a supplementary account of events in various parts of the Empire to the year 554.

After completing the seventh book of the History of the Wars, Procopius composed in 550 a history of a very different sort: the Anecdota, or Secret History. In this book he set down for posterity all that he had not dared to say in his earlier work. For obvious reasons, the book was not published until after the death of the principals and, very likely, Procopius himself. The Empress Theodora is particularly singled out as the object of his dislike, but Justinian receives scarcely better treatment. Even Belisarius is attacked unmercifully. The black picture of his employers which Pro-

copius paints is doubtless exaggerated, yet he is consistent in statements of fact: it is his attitude alone that has changed.

Still another side of Procopius is revealed in his final work on the public buildings erected during the reign of Justinian. The style is that of a true Byzantine panegyric, as laudatory of the Emperor as the Secret History is otherwise. Perhaps the cool objectivity of the History of the Wars, in which Justinian often appears in an unfavorable light while Belisarius is openly praised, did not please the Emperor. Whatever may have been the reason that prompted Procopius to write the six short books comprising this work, there can be no doubt that he performed the task to the complete satisfaction of the Imperial Majesty. The tone of the whole is in keeping with the regular Byzantine attitude toward the head of the State, and Procopius, who had elsewhere expressed to his satisfaction his feelings concerning Justinian, found no difficulty in composing an adequate official panegyric.

Although the chief value of the work lies in the store of historical information it contains, it is not unpleasant to read; the necessary rhetoric that serves as a vehicle is not too burdensome. The description of the rebuilding of Hagia Sophia which begins the volume is deservedly famous, and there are other pleasant descriptions as well (e.g., I.xi.1-7). Some of the stories he tells are quite appealing, such as the account of the rebuilding of the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople, with the subsequent unearthing of the tombs of the Apostles Andrew, Luke and Timothy, and the story of the foundation of the asylum for women (I.ix.1-10), which contrasts amusingly with the account in the Secret History (xvii.5-6).

The first volume of Dr. Dewing's translation of Procopius was published in 1914. The six volumes originally planned to compass the work have grown into seven; in this final volume Dr. Dewing has the collaboration of Professor E. Baldwin Smith of Princeton University as well as that of Dr. Glanville Downey. The text followed throughout, with some slight modifications, is that of J. Haury in the Teubner series (Leipzig, 1905-13, 3 vols.). The translation has been made with care, and is uniformly easy to read.

Dr. Dewing and his collaborators have taken pains to provide helpful notes in difficult passages, to give the modern equivalents of place names wherever possible, and to clarify the various architectural terms used. The plans and maps included are necessarily small in size, but adequate for the purpose intended. There is an index of Latin words used by Procopius, and a general index to the complete translation. The general index seems to be accurate and reasonably complete: it occupies the last 140 pages of the volume. The usual excellent mechanical standards of the Loeb Edition prevail.

HOLLIS R. UPSON

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY

## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

## ANCIENT AUTHORS

**Horace.** KARL BÜCHNER. *Der Siebente Brief des Horaz.* The Epistle illustrates the kind of friendship which existed between Horace and Maecenas. In expressing his decision to stay away from Rome longer than he had at first planned, Horace hints that the gift of the Sabine villa would not have been a genuine gift unless accompanied by the understanding that he could enjoy it freely. The value of a gift is measured not by the sacrifice which it entailed on the part of the donor but by the worthiness of the recipient. True gratitude, therefore, can be shown only by proving worthy of the gift. The poet's age and impaired health are so well known to Maecenas that Horace does not need to mention them as reasons for shunning the city in summer. The fondness, constantly implied but never expressed, which Horace has for the Sabine farm shows better than words how much Horace appreciates Maecenas' gift.

H 75 (1940) 64-80

(Kirk)

**Menander.** ALFRED KÖRTE. *Menanders Priesterin.* The surviving fragments indicate that the Priestess of Menander had an unusual plot. The heroine, for whom the comedy is named, is not a young married woman but the mother of two grown-up children. The influence of Euripides is seen in the double recognition (cf. Euripides' *Ion*), one recognition being false, when the husband of the priestess returns after a long absence in search of their son. Menander appears to have been less interested in the development of plot than in the drawing of character, and evidence is submitted that he adopted indiscriminately from Euripides whatever seemed useful to him.

H 75 (1940) 106-16

(Kirk)

## ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

HOLLAND, BENITA DAVENPORT. *A Kylix in the Fogg Art Museum. A Study in the use of Design in the Attribution of Greek Vases.* A study of the drawing technique used in no. 501.1937, an Athenian red-figured vase of the Tipe Archaic Style, confirms the opinion already reached from the study of the composition alone, that the kylix shows traits belonging to Douris, and places it about 470 B.C. "The freedom and lack of precision in drawing and the careless execution mark the work as done by a pupil rather than by Douris himself." Ill.

HSCPh 52 (1942) 41-63

(Charney)

ROSTOVITZ, M. *How Archaeology Aids History.* Summary of recent archaeological researches in the Near East, Greece, and Italy, with particular attention to Dura-Europos.

Yale Review 31 (1942) 713-29

(Spaeth)

STECHOW, WOLFGANG. *The Myth of Philemon and Baucis in Art.* Representations in art of this Ovidian myth are comparatively scarce and incoherent. The transformation of the old couple into trees was restricted to book illustration; but their hospitality, and especially their simple meal with the two gods, attracted the attention of artists. Ill.

Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld

Institutes 4 (1940-41) 103-13

(Spaeth)

WILLIAMS, PHYLLIS L. *Two Roman Reliefs in Renaissance Disguise.* Discussion of two Roman funerary monuments included among the antiquities published in 1534 by Petrus Apianus in his *Inscriptiones Sacrosanctae Vetustatis*. Ill.

Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld

Institutes 4 (1940-41) 47-66

(Spaeth)

## EPIGRAPHY. NUMISMATICS. PAPHYROLOGY

MILNE, J. G. *A group of coins attributable to the Revolt of Naxos in 467.* In 1907 W. Wroth (JHS xxvii 90) republished a group of Greek staters of six types, all having a bunch of grapes common to their obverses, of which three had originally been assigned by Head (NC ser. 3 xi 1) to Cyrene and the fourth by Svoronos (Jour. int. arch. num. 1905 339) to Macedonia. Because one type bore the letters Π Ε and two other pieces had been found on that island, Wroth proposed to assign the whole group to Peparethos. Data relative to coin finds collected since Wroth shows that coins of higher denomination cannot be conclusively considered as struck at or near the places they are found. On artistic rounds four of the types date in the first half of the fifth century. This, along with the fact that they are of Euboeo-Attic standard, Attic technique, and of Ionic style, point to the Cyclades. If the history of the Cyclades at this period is searched, the only island to fit the case as their issuing agent is Naxos on its revolt from the Delian League in 467. M. agrees that the fifth type is correctly assigned to Petarethos and the sixth possibly so.

NC 20 (1940) 76-88

(Mosser)

— *The mint of Kyme in the third century B.C.* The organization of Greek city mints and the position of authorities responsible for the issue of coins are problems not much explored: there is little direct evidence and little prospect of finding more. However, material might be accumulated for testing hypotheses by investigation of issues of particular mints. The third-century coinage of Kyme in Aeolis is taken as an example. Three fairly long series of bronze coins struck at Kyme and a small group of silver half-drachms are assigned to the period. All, with only two exceptions, have magistrates' names in full with a symbol on silver or monogram on bronze. Monograms are not constantly associated with same names; some occur with different names, and conversely some names with different monograms. The relation of monograms to names is not easy to determine; they can most naturally be explained as abbreviated forms of personal names. An hypothesis which seems likely is that they refer to men who made coins to the order of the magistrates. Symbols found on the silver coins probably served the same purpose, their use being due to aesthetic considerations.

NC 20 (1940) 129-37

(Mosser)

O'NEIL, B. H. STJ. *Some overstrikes and other Roman coins from Maiden Castle, Dorset.* Brief comment on coins found in excavations at Maiden Castle, 1934-37, with discussion of six barbarous overstrikes of the type of Constantius II over earlier Constantinian issues.

NC 20 (1940) 179-84

(Mosser)

TSCHERIKOWER, V. and HEICHELHEIM, F. M. *Jewish Religious Influence in the Adler Papyri?* T. argues that the assumed indications of Jewish influence in these papyri are quite inadequate, and can all be better explained by Egyptian or Hellenistic analogies; some of his arguments are answered by H.

HThR 35 (1942) 25-44

(Walton)